

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/800,941

First Named Applicant: Nobori

Examiner: J. Huber

Art Unit: 2621

Status of the Application: pending final Office Action

Issue to be Discussed:

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katta in view of Karanovic.

First, applicant notes that because Katta is cutting and pasting images to form the synthesized image, the problem of distortion is not present and thus filtering is not needed by the system disclosed in Katta.

Nonetheless, applicant proposes to more particularly recite that applicant's parameter selection section stores image synthesis parameter groups and filter parameter groups as predefined associated pairs where each pair corresponds to a different vehicle speed and/or driver selection (as shown in applicants' Fig. 10); and then further clarify that the parameter selection section selects an image synthesis parameter group-filter parameter group pair based on vehicle speed and/or driver selection.

Suggested claim language is as follows:

... a parameter storage section for storing a plurality of sets of associated pairs of an image synthesis parameter group representing the correspondence between the camera images and the synthesized image and a filter parameter group corresponding to the image synthesis parameter group, each of said associated pairs corresponding to a different vehicle speed condition ...

... a parameter selection section for selecting at least one pair among the plurality of sets... according to vehicle speed ~~a motion of the vehicle~~ detected by a vehicle motion detection section ...

Even if Karanovic teaches anti-aliasing, it does not teach that the appropriate filter cut/off frequency would be associated and used with a corresponding parameter group, where the parameter group is used to distinguish a frame-based synthesis from a field-based synthesis.

Would such amendment overcome the currently applied references?